

REMARKS

Summary

Claims 1-5, 7-15 and 17-33 are pending. Claims 1, 3-5, 7, 10-11, 13, 15, 17, 20-25, 27-28 and 30 have been amended, and claims 31-33 have been added. All amendments are fully supported by the original disclosure. No new matter has been introduced.

Objections

Claim 21 was objected to for containing various typographical errors. Appropriate correction has been made in the amendments to the claims.

Rejections Under 35 USC 112

Claims 1-5, 7-15, and 17-30 are rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. This rejection has been obviated by the amendments to the claims. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

Rejections Under 35 USC 103(a)

Claims 1, 3-5, 11, 13-15, 21-24, 25, 27-28, and 30 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 5,880,733 to Horvitz (Horvitz) and US Patent No. 6,590,592 to Nason (Nason). Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection in light of the amendments to the claims and the remarks below.

Each of claims 1, 11, 21, 25, and 28 has been amended to clearly recite rendering on the front and back surfaces of a plane metaphoric desktop, and the front and back surfaces are opposite facing surfaces of a plane metaphoric desktop, with the back surface being invisible while the front surface is visible, and vice versa, resulting in the second execution results rendered on the back surface not visible while the front surface is the currently visible

surface, and becoming visible when the back surface is morphed to replace the front surface as the currently visible surface.

Such recitations are not taught or suggested by Horvitz. As the Examiner has acknowledged, Horvitz merely discloses window 44 as first rendered in the “back” of the virtual space, and zoomed to the “front” of the virtual space, in response to a user command. Both the “frontally” and “backward” located windows 38 and 44 of the 3D space are rendered on the front surface of the metaphoric desktop. Nothing in Horvitz teaches or suggests rendering on the back surface of a plane metaphoric desktop. Accordingly, neither windows 38 and 44, nor anything else in Horvitz, teach or suggest the required rendering on the front and back opposite surfaces of a metaphoric desktop.

Nason fails to overcome the deficiencies discussed above with respect to Horvitz. Nason merely shows a graphical user interface with the capability of displaying multiple displays or interfaces at the same time using a separately defined overscan area which may be toggled on and off. As such, Nason does not provide a teaching or suggestion of rendering on the front and back opposite surfaces of a plane metaphoric desktop as recited in claims 1, 11, 21, 25, and 28.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, claims 1, 11, 21, 25, and 28 are patentable over Horvitz in combination with Nason.

Claims 3-5, 13-15, 22-24, 27, and 30 depend from claims 1, 11, 21, 25, and 28, respectively incorporating their features. Therefore, for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to the independent claims, claims 3-5, 13-15, 22-24, 27, and 30 are patentable over Horvitz and Nason.

Claims 2, 12, 26, and 29 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horvitz, Nason and US Patent No. 6,760,750 to Boneh (Boneh).

Claims 2, 12, 26, and 29 depend on claims 1, 11, 21, 25, and 28, incorporating their features, respectively. Since claims 1, 11, 21, 25, and 28 are patentable over Horvitz and

Nason, therefore, by definition, claims 2, 12, 26, and 29 are patentable over Horvitz and Nason, for at least the reasons discussed above. Boneh does not remedy the above discussed deficiencies of Horvitz and Nason. Thus, claims 2, 12, 26, and 29 are patentable over Horvitz and Nason even when combined with Boneh.

Claims 7 and 17 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horvitz, Nason and US Patent No. 6,552,733 to Taylor (Taylor).

Claims 7 and 17 depend on claims 1 and 11, incorporating their features, respectively. Since claims 1 and 11 are patentable over Horvitz and Nason, therefore, by definition, claims 7 and 17 are patentable over Horvitz and Nason, for at least the reasons discussed above. Taylor does not remedy the above discussed deficiencies of Horvitz and Nason. Thus, claims 7 and 17 are patentable over Horvitz and Nason even when combined with Taylor.

Claims 8-10 and 18-20 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horvitz, Nason, Taylor, and Boneh.

Claims 8-10 and 18-20 depend on claims 1 and 11 respectively, incorporating their limitations. Since claims 1 and 11 are patentable over Horvitz and Nason, therefore, by definition, claims 8-10 and 18-20 are patentable over Horvitz and Nason, for at least the reason discussed above. Boneh and Taylor do not remedy the above discussed deficiencies of Horvitz and Nason, therefore, for at least the same reasons discussed above, claims 8-10 and 18-20 are patentable over Horvitz and Nason, even when combined with Taylor and Boneh.


Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-5, 7-15 and 17-33 are in condition for allowance, and early issuance of the Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overages to Deposit Account No. 500393.

Respectfully submitted,
Schwabe, Williamson and Wyatt, PC

Date: December 5, 2005


Steven Prewitt
Registration No. 45,023

Pacwest Center, Suites 1600-1900
1211 SW Fifth Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97204
503-796-2437